L P. 1893

P21

G R - IX 1

In reference
mem! 10-88

1896-97

191 .

(Rev. A.)

File No. 51-96

Serial Nos.

Later references
Mem(101-01

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

M Part B for Feb 1898

SUBJECT.

Levy of the foreign liquor license fees on shops in Iraq-Calcutta.

W D 1350—GPB—30,000 28-1-19

(21)

Office Note dated 28-11-95

Subject :- Rates of Registration Fees levied by the Municipal Boards of the Bangalore City & Mysore Town on places of licensed by Govt. under the Excise Act for the sale of Spirituous & fermented liquors.

Reference — Excise Commrs. Letter No. 315/27

1 - In the above letter the Excise Commissioner made a proposal to revise the license fees payable by Foreign Liquor Shops, under Notification No. 31 dated 5-89 stated that - "both at the cities of Bangalore & Mysore, a registration fee of Rs 50/- per annum is levied by the Municipality on Retail, Hotel & Refreshment-Rooms Licenses in addition to the above rates" -

2 As this Office had some doubts that the uniform fee of Rs 50/- was levied by the Board, on the above classes of licenses, enquiry was made, & it was found that the following rates were levied at each place by the Municipality -

Bangalore City Board Class of Shop.	Rates charged for registration certificates under Municipal laws by the Board	Mysore City Board Class of Shop	Rates charged for Registration certificates under Municipal laws by the Board	Remarks
Wholesale — nil —	nil	(1) Wholesale — nil	nil	
Retail — each	50	(2) Retail shops:		
Hotel (only one)	12	3 @ 25/-	25/-	* where the monthly sale of liquor is more than Rs 200/- & less than Rs 20
Refreshment-Room (only one)	5	5 @ * 12/2/-	12/8	
Occassional Licenses for sales to be under Manual each	5	(3) Hotel — nil	nil	
		(4) - 1 - Refreshment Room	25/-	
		(5) - nil - Occassional Lic	nil.	

3 His two Boards can

section 58 of the Municipal Regulations, (2)
charge any of the 6 rates specified in
Schedule C.II, attached thereto, for "Certi
ficates of Registration" for each place
of business".

4: In this connection two
points may be raised:-

(a) It would be preferable for
the Board to adopt the classification
as per margin as authorized
by Govt under the Excise
Act and fix any one of
the ~~IV~~ V rates of registration
two specified in Schedule C.II of the
Municipal Regulations for each of
the several kinds of licenses. Not
to say there are 8 "Retail licenses" under the Excise Act
Let
the Board fix any of the 6 classes of
Registration fees, uniformly, for all, & not
different rates for the same kind of
licenses. (Vide Bangalore Dy Commr's
views expressed in Letter No 563 of 1880
which were exactly those which influ
enced the Government when framing
and passing Notification No 81 of 1889 above
alluded to. —

1 Wholesale
2 Retail
3 Hotel
4 Refreshment-Rooms
5 occassional

1 Class 1 = Rs 100
" 2 = 50
" 3 = 25
" 4 = 12

(b) But the Bangalore City Board
is evidently in error in charging
a fee of Rs 5/- & the Mysore City
Board of Rs 12/2, as such rates do not

specified in Schedule C II of the Municipal Regulations.

Orders are solicited to refer to General Branch concerned, for disposal, as the 3rd Commissioner personally directed that questions may be separately disposed of.

28/11/95

S. A.

This is a matter that concerns the Municipality & not the Excise Dept. In his letter of 12th July last, the Excise Comr. observed that in addition to the License fee levied by the Excise Dept, a Registration fee of Rs 50 was being levied by the Municipal Boards of Bangalore & Kolar &c. I understand some information (semi-official) would show that the Registration fee is not levied & collected [illegible]

Under consideration from the rates land down in schedule C II of the Municipal Regulation. It is for the Municipal Council to apply * & regulate the classes of business in question & to determine the Regulation is applicable thereto, such does not bring it within the rates prescribed by the aforesaid schedule. I would invite the attention of the Municipal Branch of Europe to this question & leave it to that Branch to take any action which it may deem [illegible]

* sections 58 & 59 of the Municipal

Transferred to the municipal branch [illegible]

[illegible]

(5)

Memo

The President of the Bangalore City municipality brings to notice that one Ramaswami Naidu refuses to register his arrack shop in the village of Gavipuram within the municipal limits of the City on payment of As 180 prescribed by the Municipal Regulations. The Shop keeper refuses to register the shop on the ground that he bought 8 shops including the one at Gavipuram of the Agar Taluk, from Govt at public auction for As 2320; and that he is paying the amount according to the prescribed instalments and that he is not liable to pay a separate registration fee.

the right to sell arrack in

(2) On a reference to the

marginally noted Proceedings, (1) clo 9/15·16 Dy 5·6

It would appear that the (2) clo 537·8 Dy 14/4/18 31

villages of Ulundeddupalya (6)
(near the Palace) and Ganapur
were included within Municipal
limits of the City of Bangalore
in 1885 and 1886 respectively.
But arrack shops located
in these villages were respectively
included in the "III Taluk"
and "V Yelagara" Vend forms,
(Vide page 4 of Pro clo 7885·94
Exc 233
dated 5/3/96) and in the
Notification of sale of these arrack ^ in respect
vend forms, no condition
is attached binding the
shop keepers to pay a
registration fee of 1800 Rs,
while such condition
is inserted in the notice of sale
of separate arrack shops
in the Cities of Mysore as well as Bangalore.
(Please see para 7 clause
4 of Notification clo 8032·4 Dy
245·1
5/3/86 from page 5·6 of the above

1175

(1)

above Proceedings. Thus
the purchaser at auction
sale is not liable to the
payment of the fee under
sec 5·8 of the Municipal Regulations
claimed by the President.
~~The process has~~ If at all, the
payment has to be made,
it is submitted, by a deduction
from the periodical
payments made to Govt
on account of these two
shops. But the President
raises the question in
respect of only one shop
in Gaurpur and not in
respect of that situated in Ellumreddy-
palya. Then the President
be asked to state whether
Registration fee of Rs 180
is being collected annually
in respect of the said

Ok

shop in the village of (8)
Mmuneddepalya, which
was included within
municipal limits so far
back as 1885.

Submitted for orders.
GWJ
26/10.

(3) In reply to an
enquiry made from this
office on the above point,
the President states that
no registration fee is levied
on the Arrack shop at
Mmuneddepalyam also The
remaining 26 shops in the
City are, the Collectors states,
under the management of the
Municipality and that those
in the villages of Mmuneddepalya
and Jayapura are under that
of the Revenue authority. It
is not clear whether the realizations
from these shops are credited
to Municipal funds, as in the case of the remaining 26 shops
submitted. GWJ 31/2/97

excess Surcharge or
4 cts on every Gallon above 5
in a month

No. 154.

Inquire (by wire) whether this surcharge is being levied on the shops in question, and request a very early reply.
5/2/97.

(9)

No 9035/139-93 dt 10/2/97 (Sl. No 5)

(4) The above information being called for, the President states that no surcharge is levied on excess sales of arrack over 5·5 gallons from the arrack shops at Attanagalla and Gampaha as they have not yet been brought under control of the City Municipality. The President adds that the question of levying registration fees on these shops is pending before Govt and that when this is sanctioned surcharge will also be levied.

(5) From enquiries made in the office, it is

learnt that the only question now pending before Govt is the levy of Foreign liquor License fees, of which Revenue file etc 5/3 of 93 is herewith submitted.

Submitted for orders.

The municipality shall not be entitled to the Registration fee unless the shops in questions are sold as separate shops and brought under the management of the municipality, like the remaining shops within municipal limits

DVG
16/3

(13)

(a. File etc 256 of 93 in re Retail arrack shops also putup)

Drawn the attention of the Excise Comr to the fact that Gantimaan & Choom - redi Nallam Kallu have long been included within Municipal limits, & enquire why the shops should not be sold as separate shops instead of being included in certain Toddy farms. Board is entitled to a registration fee on every shop

Submitted

b. The shops in question not having been included in the Notification to Separate shops, and as the Notification regarding Toddy farms is silent about the payment of registration fee, the shopkeepers were naturally misled. It is true that the Arrack Rules impose the liability on all shopkeepers in the Districts of Bangalore &c; but, under the circumstances, the accused may be excused, as it is only a technical liability.

To Hd Asst (Rev) 90, Mumbe Nanjaya will be allowed to retain the shop at Gauribidanur, presumably beyond municipal limits.

7/3/93

(V)

The Municipality enquire how the Arrack Contr. would stand at the Privy Council being met.

Ascertain also whether Mr Mainwaring objects to the Gauripur shop being removed to the Municipal limits.

Draft as
19/3/97

19/3/97

No. 5174/860 of 13-4-97.

8. In reply the Ex Commr states that the arrack shop at Mamreddipalya has always been beyond Municipal limits and, hence, has not been sold as a separate shop. This appears inconsistent with the fact that the village itself "was included within Mc limits so far back as 1885" (Vide para 2 of notice). and at 24 in 1892/96 from the Commr. Some explanation on this point seems necessary, and the order will require to be pointed out to him.

9. As regards the shop at Gauripur, the fact of its being within the Mc limits is stated not to have been hitherto brought to the Ex Commr's notice by the Mcty. The consumption is not more than 150 gallons per mensem and hence the shop cannot be sold separately or subjected to the heavy license fee of Rs 1800. It is now intended to remove the shop beyond Mc limits to Attamangalam.

Submit for orders.

23/4/97.

The Municipality [illegible] is reported to be outside Municipal limits. It was not sold as a separate shop. The Municipality cannot therefore charge fee on this shop.

Gauripur was never sold as a separate shop. The Board never asked that it be so sold. The consumption is very small. The farmer is at Erode. The shop will be removed to Village outside Municipal limits from 1897/98.

For the above reasons

(12)

The President may be
informed that the Govt are
not prepared to authorize
the Board to insist upon
Payment of the registration
fee in respect of either
of the ships in question.

Randolph

1/5/97

(13)

F. 80/3527

Section Mun
File No 51-96
Serial No 1
OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
City Bangalore, 19th October 1896

No. 83
Enc: one file

From

The President, Municipal Commission,
Bangalore City.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General & Rev. Departments,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In submitting the accompanying file of papers regarding the refusal of one Mapuri Ramaswami Naidu to register his Arrack Shops and pay a fee of Rs. 180/- to the Municipality, I have the honor to state that the Arrack Shops is situated in the Ganiguranu Village within the limits of the Municipality, and as such the holder of the Shops is bound to register it and pay a fee of Rs. 180/- under section 58 of the Municipal Regulations. A notice was accordingly served on him and he objects to pay the fee claimed and register his shops on the ground that this shops is among those (8 Shops in number) included in Agar Tirka the exclusive privilege of the right

of

of Vending arr in which was pur-
-chased by him for Rs. 2320/- and that
he is not therefore liable to pay sepa-
-rately for it to the Municipality. The
Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore
to whom a reference was made is of
opinion that the shop cannot bear
such a heavy tax as Rs. 180/- as judged
from the consumption of arrack
in it [illegible] I beg to submit that
the Municipal Regulations do not
provide for any reduced rates ac-
-cording to the quantity consumed,
but fix a fee of Rs. 180/- irrespective
of the sales. I may also mention
that this shop was not required
to be registered hitherto, the cause
of which it is not possible to trace.

2. No liquor shop can be opened
for business within Municipal
limits without paying the fee of
Rs. 180/- This cannot be evaded; but
as the holder of this shop apparently
is under the impression that because
he bought the right to 8 shops of the
Agara Pirka from your municipal
public auction and that no objection
has hitherto been made by the
Municipality therefore the Muni-

- cipality

Municipality cannot now claim the fee of Rs. 180/- from him under the Regulations. I have therefore abstained from putting the Regulations in force until I laid the matter before Government and I solicit that early orders on this subject may be issued.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt.

T. Pearse

MR

11½

Read..

Letter No 833 of 19 Oct
from the President Mu
Commr, Bangalore C
Subg for orders a f
of papers regarding the
refusal of one Nagapur
Ramaswami Naidu to
register his arack shop
situated in the Sanjeev
village & pay a fee of
Rs 180 to the Municipality

SR

mnl 51-96

1765

5010
139—93 27/10/96

Munl
51-96
Regn. No 2

Order thereon

Before passing orders
on the above, the President
~~is to be~~ is requested to report
whether the Registration fee of
Rs 180, is being collected
annually in respect of the
Arack shop in the village
of Muninedalipalya which
was included within Munl
limits so far back as 1885.

27/10/96

prescribed by the
Municipal Regulations

The President.
Munl Commrs
Bangalore City

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No. ——
No.

Enclosure No.

L. 1489/6368

Section Mine
File No 51-96
Serial No 3.

(7)

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
City Bangalore, 25th January 1897

No. 175.
Revenue

From

The President, Municipal Commission,
Bangalore City.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments
Bangalore

Sir,

Referring to Government Proceedings No 5070 / F 139-93 dated 27th October last, I have the honor to forward for information Copy of Memo No 203 of the 22nd Instant from the Collection Officer, from which it will be observed that no Registration fee is levied on the Arrack Shop at Munireddepalya

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obedient
Servant

For PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE CITY.

(18)

No 203. Memo
22-1-97.

In reply to President's Reminder No 908 dated 6th Jan'97 I beg to state that the Ejardar of arrack shops of Yesvanthpoor Hobly which includes the Attack Shop in Munnireddy Pollya is always absent from Bangalore. Hence the information which I wanted to gather from him could not be obtained. However I beg to state that though the said Village was brought within the Municipal limits of the City of Bangalore so far back as 1883 the Municipality did not levy any Registration or License fees on the aforesaid Shop which it is said has been opened since the year 1894 except a Mohatarfa rate or Candayam

— as it was neither included in the list of Arrack shops that was generally furnished by the Deputy Commissioner to the Municipality nor the latter had any Control over it. The number of Arrack Shops for the City of Bangalore is limited. Its number was only 26 and fees are regularly collected thereon The above Shop (viz) in Muniredoy Pollya as well as the one in the Village of Gavipuram, it may be said, was, and is still under the Control of the Revenue authorities. For these reasons a move was made that first the arrack Shop in the Village of Gavipuram should be brought within the operation of the Municipal Regulations in force and if sanction was accorded to the same by the Higher authorities it was the further intention to make the above order also applicable to the arrack

Shop

(20)

Shop in the Village of —
Munireddy Pallya —

(Signed) P Swamidass
Collection Officer

"Copy" H Cameron —

By PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE, CITY.

Gen. 31

1896-97

From

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore, Genl & Rev. Depts

To

The President of the Bangalore city Municipality

Dated 10th

Despatched Feby 97.

Received

General No. 9035

D. F. No. 139-93

Enclosure No.

His Rr 175 of 25th January 1897

From the Commr requesting that With reference to the above, the President of Bangalore city Municipality will be requested to report at a very early date whether the surcharge or fee of 4 annas on every gallon of Arrack over 55 gls sold in a month in the shops at Ammunreddipalayam & Gandhinagar is levied from Arrack Renters on the shops in question and credited to Municipal Funds.

"By Order"

for Secy to Govt

L. 151 / 1081

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,

No. 202

City Bangalore, 16th February 1897.

17

From

The President, Municipal Commission,
Bangalore City.

Mun
54-96

To

The Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
General and Revenue depts
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your docket-
No 9035
L. 7. 139-93 of the 10th instant, I
have the honour to state that no
surcharge is levied on excess sales
of arrack over 55 gallons from
the arrack shops at Munireddi-
palyam and Ganigapur as they
have not as yet been brought
under control of the City
Municipality. The question
of levying Registration fees on
these shops is under

(25

before Government - and when this
is sanctioned, surcharge will also
be levied.

I have the honour to be.

Sir

Your most obed- Servt-

T. T. Jones

PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,

BANGALORE, CITY.

Ba. C.

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore
Read:- (24)

Correspondence ending with letter
No: 202 d/ 16-February 1897, from the
President of the Bangalore city
Municipality in regard to the registration-
fee claimed by the Municipal Board
on arrack shops in Yanipur and
Munireddipalya.

1897

(Order thereon, No: 10834-5 / 139-98 d/ 1-4-97
to issue
D/ Bangalore, ~~16 Aug 1897~~.

In forwarding the above correspondence in original, the attention of the Excise Commissioner is drawn to the fact that Yanipur and Munireddipalya have long been included within Municipal limits. He is requested to report why the shops thereat were not sold as separate shops instead of being

x to be returned with his reply

included in certain (25) large rural farms
and whether Attamadugu to which
place the Gunpur shop is now
proposed to be transferred (Vide
Circle rural farms Notification
for 1897-98) is within Municipal
limits.

(2) Since the Municipal Board
of the Bangalore City is entitled
to a registration fee on every
shop in the Municipality, it
should be stated how the Excise
Commissioner would suggest
their present demand being met.

31/3/11

For
Assistant Secretary.

Comptd:
To, The President, Bangalore City Municipality

Excise Commissioner,
with enquiry correspondence.
to be returned with reply.

Copied

(8)

Gen 30 | 8357 7-4-97

1897

Bd 1696 1966

From

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 2nd April 1897

Despatched 6th April 1897

Received

Enclosure No.

General No. 4833

No. 357

In reply to Government Proceedings No 10834-5 dated the 1st April 1897 & 3 1399 93

SUBJECT.

Reports the reason why the arrack Shops at Goripur & Munireddy-polya have not been sold as separate Shops of the Bangalore city

To be sent No 1115 8/21, 4/97

Mund
51-96
6

Mel 51-96
Sl 6

(47)

No 4833/353 Excise to
Bangalore, dated 2

From.

The Excise Comm
in Mys

To

The Secretary to the
Govern ment of Mysore
General & Revenue dep

Sir,

In reply to Governme
Proceedings No 10834-5 dated
d.i. 139-93
the 1st April 1897, I have the
honor to State that the Jack
of the arrack Shop at
Gavipur being in the Bangal.
city Municipal limits was
not reported to this office
by the Municipality. The consu
in this Shop not being m
than eighteen gallons per

it is not fit to be sold as a separate shop, more particularly as the licensee cannot afford to pay the Municipal Registration fee. Therefore it has been included in a Vend Farm. It will be transferred from 1897-98 to Attavadagu which is beyond the Municipal limits.

2 The Excise Superintendent reports that the arrack shop of Munireddypolya has always been beyond the Municipal limits, and therefore it has not been brought under "Separate Shops".

3. Under the above circumstances no Registration fee is payable to the Municipality on account of the above arrack shops.

I have the honorable
Sir,
Your most obedient humble
servant
M. Duraiswamy
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Rd 57-96 47

To. 9

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

11/50 9/12-4-97
139-93
R1875

His letter etc $\frac{4833}{353}$ dated
2nd April 1897

Section Mund
Ic No 57-96
Serial No 1

With reference to the above has the honor to request that the Excise Commissioner will be so good as to return the original correspondence forwarded with Govt Pro etc $\frac{10834}{139-93}$ dy 1-4-97

By order.

9/4/97

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No. _____
No.

Enclosure No.

(2)

Submitted.
does have to be passed
Excise Comr's 4833/353 Dy
9) (Sl etc's on file). Dy 22/4/97

Dwk 21-96

SLS



L 155-9½



From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore.
Revenue & General Depts.

Dated 13th April 1897

Dispatched 14th

Received

General No. 5774

No. 368

Enclosure No. Copies

In reply to Secretary's Docket No. 1115 D
G.S. 139-93

dated the 12th April 1897

SUBJECT.

Returns the original correspondence relating to the Arrack Shops at Ganeshwaradi Muneswaradyapalliya, Bangalore Taluk

Dw 15-4-97

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

No. 5174/368 Records.

Excise Commissioner's
Bangalore dated 13th April 18

From,

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of
General and Revenue De

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. III/271 dated the 12th April 1897, I have the return herewith the original cases relating to the Arrack Shops at Gavipur Muniveddypollya, Bangalore taluk

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

M Murray

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

11

(52)

and 51-96

Read Correspondence ending with letter etc to 5174/368 dated 13: April 1897 from the Excise Commissioner in regard to the claim preferred by the municipal Board of Bangalore for the registration fee on an arrack shops in Jayapura and

Record No Misc
No 51-96
Serial No 9

Ellanuddapalya

Order thereon 2192-93 d. 7139-93 8/10/97

(2) Govt observe that the arrack shop at Jayapura was never sold as a separate shop and the Board never asked that it be so sold. The assumption was therefore wrong. The farmer is not liable to pay the registration fee. It is ordered that the shop will be removed to

a village outside Municipal limits from 1897-98

(2) Though called Munireddypalya a shop, ~~it~~ to be ~~situated~~ is reported, ~~to be~~ outside Municipal limits and consequently it was not sold as a separate shop. The Municipality cannot therefore charge a fee on this shop

(3) For the reasons noted above, the President is informed that the Govt are not prepared to authorize the Board to insist upon payment of the registration fee in respect of either of the shops in question

6/5/97
Secretary

To The President. Bangalore City
Excise Commissioner

L W88
&968

(84)

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,

No. 119

City Bangalore, 4th Dec 1897

Encl

From

The President, Municipal Commission,

Bangalore City.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments,

Bangalore.

Sir,

Mural
51-96
Series No

Sir.

Adverting to para 2 of Government Proceedings No 12192-3 dated 2.7.139-93

8/11 10th May 1897, I have the honor to state that the Arrack shop at Munireddipalya is reported to be within Municipal limits being situated almost in the centre of the village. I beg also to advert to Government Notification Camp No 891 dt 14th September 1885, from which it will be seen that the village of Munireddipalya was one

within Municipal limits for over 12 years. I request that Government would be pleased to authorize the Board to recover the Registration fee from the shop in question which is reported to be in existence since 1894. Copy of Collector's Memo No 204 dated 4th ultimo is submitted for information together with Copy of Correspondence with the Excise Commissioner on the subject

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt Servant

T. T. Lewin

PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE, CITY.

(85

1897/8

From

The President,

Bangalore City Municipality.

To The Excise Commissioner
In Mysore
Bangalore

Dated

Despatched 4th

Received 10 Dec/97

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Sir.

With reference to your letter No 3940/613 of the 12th ultimo, I have the honor to state that the attached sheet at Mariyadeipalya is reported to be within Municipal limits being situated almost in the centre of the village. I also beg to enclose a Government notification Cumb etc 8/97 14th Sept/85 from

It will be seen that the village of Mar-palya has been within Municipal for over 12 years. I request that you will be so good as to see the justice of the Boa demand for the Registration fee, the payment of which has been evaded by the Arrack Shop Keeper. The Carrying on of the business within Municipal limits without paying the Registration fee and then trying to shift to a place just outside Municipal limits when the demand is made, cannot be allowed & much less be encouraged. The Shop Keeper is bound to pay the fee for the period he has carried on business within Municipal limits & may then remove his shop to a place far away from the village. Copies of Memos: Nos 202 and 208 of 4th inst & 3rd Instant respectively from the Collector of Municipal Taxes are enclosed for information.

I have &c
Sd/ T. T. Kumara
President

"Copy"

T. T. Kumara

(38)

No 202. Memo

Sir.

With reference to correspondence
marginally noted in re Arrack
Shop in Munnireddipalya, I beg
to state that on more than two
occasions I found the Arrack
Shop was closed and I was
told that the shop was to be
removed outside Munnireddipalya
limits. In the Government Noti-
fication Comb. No. 422 dated 15th
March 1897 it is remarked thus
against Munnireddipalya "
Arrackshop" to be transferred
to Sultan Palya" This has not
been done up to date The Shop
in question is now held

Municipalitya within Munic-
ipal limits. But this Shop was
not included in the list furnished
by the Head Inspector as one
of the shops within Municipal
limits. I have however issued a
notice to the farmer of Alsur
Hobly in which the present
Arrack Shop is situated to show
Cause why the Municipality
should not prosecute him for
dealing in Spirituous liquors
within Municipal limits.

4th Nov 1897 Sd/ P. Srinivasa Rao Pillay
Collector.

"True Copy"

T. T. Jeremiah
PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE, CITY.

(16

No 248.

Memo

Re Gun Shop Keepers Certificate Exemption Amendment

With reference to the enclosed, I beg the President will kindly refer the matter to the Excise Commissioners. The law in force does not exempt any person or persons dealing in spirituous or intoxicating liquors within City Municipal limits. The party must either take out a Certificate of Registration on payment of the prescribed fee or he must remove his business to outside the Municipal limits. The non-collection of a Registration fee for the last 5 years as stated by the Farmer is no Reason to continue the omission.

30th December 99 Sd/ P S Swan Dep Pltg Collector

"Copy"

T. T. Lee

(41

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 19th Nov/97

No. 3910
613

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To

The President of the
Bangalore City Municipality.

Sir

I have the honor to state that the Excise Head Supervisor reports that the arrack shop at Mariyeddipalya is situated about 200 yards beyond the Municipal boundary stone, and that you have lately issued instructions to have the same removed to a point to

extended. I beg to be informed if the boundary stone has been removed, to enable me to trace the structure located beyond such stone.

I have etc
Sd/- S Venkata Rangiengar
for Excise Commr

"True Copy"

T. T. Lonan

PRESIDENT [illegible]
BANGALORE CITY.

(43)

(13)

Read
Letter No 11964 - 97
from the Mgr of the Bangalore
City Municipality, with reference
to Govt Orders No 12152-3
L.F. 139-93
dt 10th May 97, that the Arrack
shop at Kumaraswamipalya is
situated within Municipal limits,
and submitting copy of his
communication to the Excise
Commr with regard to the liability
of the shop-keeper to pay the prescribed
Registration fee to the
Municipality.

Order thereon. Before passing
orders the Govt will await
the submission of a report
from the Excise Commr as
to whether it is a fact that the
shop is situated within municipal
limits of the City.

A Govt Order was issued in
this case where the
shop is situated
within the municipal
limits of Bangalore
11-11-97

9/12/97

11-11-97

To the Excise Commr
for report

Section Officer
Case No 51-96
Serial No

Govt Order No 12152-3
dt 10-5-97
L.F. 139-93

6820-21
L2.139-93
9/13/12/97

(44) 96

139-93

Branch II-I

Nr. 139-93 recp Bangalore

5 12

Sec 2/2/97

Submitted for orders whether a copy of the map communicated to the President - Bangalore City municipality a request that the submission - map called for in Pro 6820-21 / L. 139-93 dt 13/12/97 may be checked an explanation expedited and that the the circumstances under which the Godown stone was not fixed the proper place should be stated.

DJ 3/2/98

D 6 Sep
Well-
98

This settles the question - No
reply or further record is
necessary. Kindly read &
communicate this to
the President -

A.S. Chy 5/2/98

5340
Mr 27
1898 L 1578

(14)

From

To 12/2/98

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore.

General & Revenue Depts.

File No.

Serial No.

Dated

Despatched 25 January 1898

Received

General No. 5946
No. 218

Enclosure No.

In reply to Secretary's Docket
No 6820-1 dated 19th January/98
139-93 SUBJECT.

States that the arrack
Shop at Munireddipalya
is situated within the Municipal
limits of the Bangalore
city Municipality & that the
lessee of the shop has
agreed to pay the prescribed
[illegible]

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Rec.
31/1/98

xcc

No. 5946/248 Bangalore, dated 20 25-

From.

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore General & Revenue departments

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 6820-1 dated the 19th instant, D. F. 139-15 I have the honor to state that from the references furnished by the President of the Bangalore city Municipality, it is clear that Municipal Liquor is within the Municipal limits; but as the boundary Stone had not been removed from its old spot, and as the Municipality did not collect the registration fee up to last year, the Excise department did not include the shops in the list of Bangalore city shops. The President having lately proved that said

said village is within the city limits, the lessee of the Shop has agreed to pay the prescribed registration fee. The President has been informed of the same, and requested to have the boundary Stone on the Ootacamund Road removed to the proper place.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
[signature]

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

~~SAB~~ (17) (15)

Read:-

Letter no 5946/248 dated 20th January 1898 from the Excise Comr in Mysore, submitting the report called for in Govt Pro no 6820-1 dt 7.139-93 by 13.12.97 re the Arrack shop at Nunnadidevaya

Section Mysore
File No 57-96
Serial No 13

RL 1647
9571-72
LL 139-93 12/2/98
Line to President.

Order thereon

Copy of the above communication, which settles the question, is forwarded to the Presidt of the Bangalore City M.C. with the observation that no map called for in Govt Pro quoted above need be submitted by him.

Seen
for Secy
5-1-98

O/o

To the Presidt of the Bangalore City M.C. with copy of the Excise Comr's letter
Excise Comr